

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-2 are amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 4-5, 7, and 10-15 are cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1-3 and 8-9 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is requested.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 is amended to correct formalities and replace the phrase "properties of a channel" with the phrase --a classification of a channel--. Claim 2 is similarly amended.

Support for the amendment is found for example, in Fig. 10 and page 13, lines 10-24 of the specification. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Pages 5-9: Rejection of Claims 1-5 and 7-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Dilip et al. (U.S.P. 6,704,409)

On pages 5-9 of the current Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-5, 7-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Dilip et al. (U.S.P. 6,704,409).

The rejection is traversed. Independent claim 1 recites a multi-channel processing control device including:

a) "a process request determination unit accepting a plurality of process requests from a plurality of channels as communication between a user and call center, and determining whether any of the plurality of process requests from the plurality of channels are real-time process requests needing processing in real-time, or non-real-time process requests not needing processing in real-time, the determining based on an indication of a classification of a channel that generates said process requests and based on services in a queue category;"

b) "a non-real-time processing administrating unit changing processing requests among processing requests determined to be the non-real-time processing requests to the real-time processing requests when data relating to clients as processing objects is predetermined client data, and for administrating other non-real-time processing requests with priority levels therefore;"

c) "a real-time processing allocation unit allocating process requests determined to be real-time process requests to processing terminals that are currently available among a plurality of processing terminals connected to a plurality of channels capable of a real-time process;" and

d) "a non-real-time processing allocation unit allocating non-real-time processes administrated by said non-real-time processing administrating unit to any of the processing terminals, said allocation performed with consideration given to the priority level and to suitability

of the terminal for handling the process." Independent claims 2 and 8-9 have similar recitations.

Applicants submit that each of independent claims 1-2 and 8-9 recite features that are not taught by Dilip.

As a first example, Applicants submit that Dilip does not disclose any "determining . . . based on services in a queue category," as recited by claim 1 for example. By contrast, Dilip merely discloses:

The highest priority transaction is typically a telephone call because telephone calls are real-time transactions requiring faster responses than e-mail messages. However, if an e-mail is approaching its QOS limit, the e-mail may have a higher priority than all other queued transactions (including telephone calls). . . . agents are capable of handling either telephone calls or e-mails. Therefore, an available agent handles the transaction with the next highest priority, regardless of the transaction type. A particular agent may regularly switch between telephone calls and e-mails depending on the distribution of transactions in the queue. After completing step 188, the procedure returns to step 170 to determine whether a new transaction has been received.

(see, for example, col. 14, lines 36-46).

That is, Dilip merely teaches a determination of a real-time or non-real time based, instead, on a type of message and with a further assignment of priorities.

As another example, Applicants submit that Dilip does not disclose a "determining based on an indication of a classification of a channel (emphasis added)," as recited by claim 1, for example. By contrast, Dilip merely discloses:

The priority of a particular transaction may be determined by various parameters and other configuration information set by the user or administrator of the system. For example, a particular agent or group of agents may be designated as high priority . . . Alternatively, a particular type of transaction may be designated as high priority.

(see, for example, col. 11, lines 33-42):

That is, by contrast, Dilip *arguendo* teaches designating a priority based on a type of message and or type of agent.

In the section of the Office Action entitled Response to Arguments, the Examiner asserts:

The "properties of channel" since not being specifically defined in the specification, examiner given the broadest, reasonable interpretation as "the type of transaction that the request belong", for example email, telephone, fax, web services etc... can be the different types (i.e. properties) of transaction (i.e. channel). "services in a queue category" since not being defined in the specification, examiner given the claimed limitation the broadest, reasonable interpretation as "the inbound request category or the outbound request category" or the QoS that the transaction are being assigned or it can be anything since the applicant has not define(d) what it is, it is opened for

interpretation.

(Emphasis added, Action at page 4).

Applicants submit that the Examiner's assertion that "services in a queue category" are not defined in the specification is in error. Rather, Applicants respectfully point out to the Examiner that the specification specifically discloses services in a queue category, for example:

Queue categories include, for example as shown in the queue category list of Fig. 12 according to numerical value: Effective Callbacks . . . No Answer Callbacks . . . , Campaigns which are outbound tasks performed by telephone; . . . queue categories may be modified as needed, based on changes in channel classes and changes in the system.

(See, page 13, line 24 -page 14, line 14 of the specification).

As another, example, the specification discloses:

Queue category is the queue class belonging to given data, and is established by the queue categories shown in Fig. 12.

(See, page 20, lines 20-22 of the specification).

In addition, Applicants submit that Examiner's assertion that properties of a channel are not specifically defined in the specification is in error. In describing the channels the specification discloses:

The queue data constitutes a table such as is shown in Fig. 10, provided with items including Channel Type Channel classes include, for example as set forth by numerical value in the channel identification list of Fig. 11: REPs, which are operator terminals; Web agents; e-mail agents; CRM (Customer Relationship Management) agents; supervisors, who manage the operators; and segment analysis, which extracts customers targeted for outbound tasks. When the number of channel classes needs to be expanded, this channel identification list may be modified as needed.

(see, for example, page 13, lines 10-24).

Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art understands that such classification of a channel are properties of the channel.

Summary

Since features recited by each of the independent claims 1-2 and 8-9 (and dependent claim 3) are not taught by the cited art, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-3 and 8-9 allowed.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: January 22, 2008

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501